

OPINION 2235 (Case 3434)***Scleropauropus* Silvestri, 1902 (Myriapoda, Pauropoda): usage conserved**

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the usage of the name *Scleropauropus* Silvestri, 1902 for a group of pauropods (Myriapoda, Pauropoda) while also conserving as its type species the nominal species *S. hastifer* Silvestri, 1902, by replacing with an identical neotype the unsuitable holotypes of both *S. hastifer* Silvestri, 1902 (type species by monotypy) and *S. lyrifer* Remy, 1936 (consistently, but erroneously treated as the type species of *Scleropauropus* since Remy (1957)).

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Myriapoda; Pauropoda; *Scleropauropus*; *Scleropauropus hastifer*; *Scleropauropus lyrifer*; pauropods; Europe.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the holotypes of *Scleropauropus hastifer* Silvestri, 1902 and *Scleropauropus lyrifer* Remy, 1936 are set aside and the specimen at the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, labelled 'Scleropauropus lyrifer Remy ad. Montgaillard près Périgueux. Été 1946. F. Grandjean' is designated as neotype of both species.
- (2) The name *Scleropauropus* Silvestri, 1902 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy *Scleropauropus hastifer* Silvestri, 1902 is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *hastifer* Silvestri, 1902, as published in the binomen *Scleropauropus hastifer* (specific name of the type species of *Scleropauropus* Silvestri, 1902) and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) The name *lyrifer* Remy, 1936, as published in the binomen *Scleropauropus lyrifer* (a junior objective synonym of *Scleropauropus hastifer* Silvestri, 1902, as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3434

An application to conserve the usage of the name *Scleropauropus* Silvestri, 1902 for a group of pauropods (Myriapoda, Pauropoda) while also conserving as its type species the nominal species *S. hastifer* Silvestri, 1902, by replacing with an identical neotype the unsuitable holotypes of both *S. hastifer* Silvestri, 1902 (type species by monotypy), and *S. lyrifer* Remy, 1936 (consistently, but erroneously treated as the type species of *Scleropauropus* since Remy (1957)) was received from Ulf Scheller (Järpås, Sweden) and Alessandro Minelli (University of Padova, Padova, Italy) on 26 July 2007. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 65: 17–19 (March 2008). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on this case.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2009 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 65: 19. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2009 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 20: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Kottelat, Kullander, Krell, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Ng, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol and Zhang.

Negative votes – 1: Grygier.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Voting FOR the proposals, Ng stated that, as he is a proponent of simultaneous neotypes to solve intractable problems, this case had his full support.

Voting AGAINST the proposals, Grygier commented that to solve the main problem at hand (i.e. unambiguous characterisation of the genus), a neotype was only needed for *S. hastifer*. By focusing more on *S. lyrifer*, the proposed solution sought elegance at the expense of the spirit of Article 75.3.5 (likely conspecificity or not of the neotype with the holotype of *S. hastifer* was of lesser concern in this Application than its conspecificity with the holotype of *S. lyrifer*) and Article 75.3.6 (the proposed neotype was collected far from the type localities of both nominal species). Also, the authors cite no work accepting Remy's (1957) invalid proposal of *S. lyrifer* as type species, so their claim of recent consistent treatment in that respect is undocumented. A neotype candidate for *S. hastifer*, to propose to the Commission for approval, should be collected from around Rome; it can be a specimen displaying features that match the current *lyrifer*-based diagnosis of the genus, as long as it also matches the original description and what can be made of the present holotype.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

hastifer, *Scleropauropus*, Silvestri, 1902 in Berlese, A. (Ed.), *Acari, Myriopoda et Scorpiones hucusque in Italia reperta*, vol. 10. Typ. 'Vesuviana', Portici. P. 66, pl. 13.

lyrifer, *Scleropauropus*, Remy, 1936, *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **116**: 316.

Scleropauropus Silvestri, 1902 in Berlese, A. (Ed.), *Acari, Myriopoda et Scorpiones hucusque in Italia reperta*, vol. 10. Typ. 'Vesuviana', Portici. P. 66.